

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

CRISTIAN RAMOS, )  
                        )  
                        )  
Plaintiff,           )                              )  
                        )  
vs.                    )                              Case No. 19-cv-00153-SMY  
                        )  
                        )  
FEDERICO FERNANDEZ, et al., )  
                        )  
                        )  
Defendant.           )                              )

**ORDER**

**YANDLE, District Judge:**

This matter comes before the Court for case management purposes. In the Initial Scheduling and Discovery Order, the Court set a deadline of October 11, 2019 for Plaintiff to file a motion to substitute specific Defendants for the Doe Defendants or, if any of the Doe Defendants remain unidentified, to file a motion specifying additional steps that could be taken to identify the Doe Defendants. (Doc. 19, p. 3). Plaintiff was advised that failure to file a motion to substitute by that date would result in the dismissal of the Doe Defendants without prejudice. (*Id.*). Additionally, the Court set a deadline of November 11, 2019 for Plaintiff to file a motion for leave to amend the complaint to include any additional claims or parties and warned that failure to comply would likely bar further amendment of the complaint (*Id.*).

Plaintiff was granted leave to submit discovery for purposes of identifying the Doe Defendants by Order entered on October 11, 2019 (Doc. 28). On November 8, 2019, Plaintiff was granted an extension to December 11, 2019 to file a motion for leave to amend the complaint to include any additional parties (Doc. 30). Subsequently, Plaintiff filed a pleading identifying John Doe 1 (Doc. 31), but has not filed an amended complaint or other pleading identifying John Doe 2 (Correctional Officer).

Plaintiff was ordered to show cause on or before January 2, 2020 why John Doe 2 (Correctional Officer) should not be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41(b). (Doc. 41). He was advised that failure to comply with the Order would result in dismissal of John Doe 2 (Correctional Officer) for failure to comply with a court order and to prosecute his claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). Plaintiff has not responded to the Order to Show Cause.

Accordingly, Defendant John Doe 2 (Correctional Officer) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to comply with a court order and to prosecute his claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). Additionally, because the Doe Defendants have been identified and/or dismissed, Scott Thompson, Warden of Pinckneyville Correctional Center, is no longer a necessary party, and is also **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **TERMINATE** John Doe 2 (Correctional Officer) and Scott Thompson as parties.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED:** April 7, 2020

*s/ Staci M. Yandle*  
**STACI M. YANDLE**  
**United States District Judge**